	Case 3.14-cv-00092-RCJ-vvGC Document	36 Filed 05/19/15 Page 1 01 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
8		
9	JAMES TRACEY CORGAN,	3:14-cv-00692-RCJ-WGC
10	Plaintiff,	ORDER
11	vs.	re: Doc # 30
12	NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY INVESTIGATION DIVISION, et al.,))
13	Defendants.	
14		
15	Before the court is the Motion to Quash Service of Process filed by Defendant "State of Nevada	
16	Department of Public Safety (DPS), Investigation Division (NDI)" (herein DPS). (Doc. # 30.1) No.	
17	response to the motion was filed.	
18	DPS argues service on that state agency was improperly effected under Federal and State law	
19	First, Defendant argues that putative service on DPS was effected, per Defendant's motion, by serving	
20	named Defendant Brad Warwick. (Doc. # 25). While service may have been valid as to Defendan	
21	Warwick, DPS contends that under Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(j)(2)(A), for service to be valid as to the state	
22	agency, the agency's chief executive officer had to be served. According to Defendant's motion, the	
23	chief of DHS was not served and thus under Rule 4(j)(2)(A), service was not completed.	
24	Defendant DHS also argues that service was ineffective under Rule 4(j)(2)(B), which provide	
25	that service may also be effected in accordance with state law for service on an agency. Defendant cite	
26	Nev. Rev. Stat. 41.031(2) which provides that service is to be made upon the Attorney General and als	
27	the chief of the identified state agency. Defendant DHS represents that neither the Attorney General no	
28		

¹ Refers to court's docket number.

Case 3:14-cv-00692-RCJ-WGC Document 36 Filed 05/19/15 Page 2 of 2 the agency head was served and thus Rule 4(j)(2)(B) is also not satisfied. Defendant's motion presents grounds for quashing service of Plaintiff's complaint upon DHS. Additionally, Local Rule 7-2(d) provides that the failure of an opposing party to file points and authorities in response to any motion shall constitute a consent to the granting of the motion. As noted above, Plaintiff has not opposed Defendant's motion. Defendant's Motion to Quash (Doc. #30) is **GRANTED** and service is quashed as to Defendant Department of Public Safety (DPS), Investigation Division (NDI). IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: May 19, 2015. Jilum G. Cobb LIAM G. COBB UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE